Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan
Vol.15, 3 (September, 2023), pp. 3587-3598
ISSN: 2087-9490 EISSN: 2597-940X, DOI: 10.35445/alishlah.v15i3.3481

Indonesian Teachers' Self-Efficacy on Implementation Cooperation and Class Management towards Inclusive Education

Ahsan Romadlon Junaidi[1], Oktaviani Hidayah[2], Ediyanto Ediyanto[3], Asep Sunandar[4]

[1] Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia; aksan.romadlon.fip@um.ac.id
[2] Kent State University, Ohio, United States; ohidayah@kent.edu
[3] Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia; ediyanto.fip@um.ac.id
[4] Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia; e-mailasep.sunandar.fip@um.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Inclusive Education;
Indonesian Teacher;
Self-efficacy

Article history:

Received 2023-01-27
Revised 2023-04-12
Accepted 2023-08-05

ABSTRACT

In inclusive education, teachers' self-efficacy represents their self-assessment of the capability to organize classroom learning with students' various learning needs, including disabilities. The teacher's self-efficacy is observed in three aspects, namely instruction efficacy, collaboration efficacy, and managing behaviour. This study examines the effects of differences in working units, experiences of teaching students with special needs, and teacher training on inclusive education on teacher self-efficacy in the inclusive education context. The participants of this study were 233 teachers, in which most of them were women and had master's degrees. For the data analysis, we used Multi-Variate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA). This study concludes that only the teacher work unit variable induces different teacher self-efficacy scores. Teachers in elementary schools have the highest self-efficacy scores in instruction, collaboration, and managing behaviour efficacy.

Corresponding Author:
Ahsan Romadlon Junaidi
Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia; aksan.romadlon.fip@um.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education is practised based on an appreciation for student diversity. According to the Indonesia Ministry of National Education Regulation, inclusive education is the realization of an educational form that is organized without discrimination and respects the diversity of each learner (Peraturan Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional, 2009). Inclusive education is important to implement as it has many benefits, including students in inclusive schools perform as well or better than students in non-inclusive schools (Dakir, 2014; Zuniar & Chamdani, 2017), students with special needs who were delayed in the improvement of social skills experienced an increase in self-confidence related to ability and intelligence (Tugiah & Trisoni, 2022), and students who do not have a specific disability have increased social understanding and a greater understanding of accepting students with specific disabilities (Freeman & Alkin, 2000). According to Kustawan (2013), the implementation of inclusive education is guided by several principles. These principles include a) the acceptance and

accommodation of all learners; b) the identification of learners; c) the adaptation of the curriculum to meet the needs of learners; d) the design of teaching and learning materials that are comprehensible to every child; e) the organisation of the classroom to ensure accessibility; and f) the conduction of learner assessments.

The implementation of inclusive education in Indonesia still needs improvement. There are still many shortcomings, such as the way the inclusive education program is implemented, school policies that are not yet in line with inclusive education practices, learning processes that are not yet accessible, support systems such as parents and the school environment, and the ability and competence of teachers in teaching children with special needs (Sunardi, 2009). Teachers are the main key to the implementation of inclusive education, as teachers are mentors, administrators, facilitators, and evaluators (Musfira et al., 2022). Therefore, teachers must recognize and aid the fulfilment of diverse learning needs, including for students with special needs. In this context, understanding and confidence in conducting learning, implementing curriculum, and designing learning environments for students who have special needs and common students are different (Forbes, 2007; Lindsay, 2007).

Teacher competencies are essential for those who assume various roles in the field of education, such as mentors, administrators, facilitators, and evaluators. The enhancement of teacher competencies can be achieved through the process of self-assessment. Teacher self-efficacy refers to the self-assessment undertaken by an educator regarding their ability to effectively facilitate the learning process by actively engaging all students. (Sailer et al., 2021; Warsi & Khurshid, 2022), including students with learning difficulties and a lack of learning motivation (Bandura, 1982). However, the existing teacher self-efficacy instruments have not explicitly linked students' learning problems with special needs (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Teacher self-efficacy is correlated to teachers' confidence in their ability to organize classes with diverse student conditions and carry out tasks requiring special skills, such as those associated with students with special needs. Therefore, a high level of teacher efficacy is one of the dominant factors influencing the inclusive education practice (Sharma et al., 2012). Further, teachers' efficacy also determines their positive attitude towards inclusive education (Ahsan et al., 2012). In Indonesia, teachers have received numerous training or in-service training programs about inclusive education provided by the Ministry of Education and the provincial, district and city governments (Junaidi & Junaidi, 2019). Therefore, the teachers should have learned and been qualified to apply various approaches and strategies in inclusive education. Consequently, the effects of these training programs on teachers' self-efficacy should be investigated.

Self-efficacy is essential for teachers who teach students with special needs because of its positive correlation with job satisfaction (Viel-Ruma et al., 2010). Teacher self-efficacy predicts work stress and mental fatigue and burnout in their work (Lipscomb et al., 2022; Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008). Horne & Timmons found that teachers feel frustrated and guilty when they are unable to direct the best learning for all their students in inclusive classrooms (Horne & Timmons, 2009). Several factors influence teacher self-efficacy in teaching participants with disabilities, such as teacher knowledge about students with disabilities, training on inclusive education, and their experience in teaching students with disabilities (Loreman et al., 2013; Merritt et al., 2017).

Research on teacher self-efficacy towards inclusive education has been widely carried out. Study conducted by You, Kim, & Shin points out that in inclusive education, teacher self-efficacy has been demonstrated to boost teachers' successful teaching practices and students' positive learning outcomes, the scale that used on the research is Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale that consists of 12 items using 5 points Likert scale (You et al., 2019). Then, a study conducted by Emmers, Baeyens, & Petry used The Teacher self-efficacy for Inclusive Practice (TEIP) and Sentiments, Attitudes, Concerns regarding Inclusive Education-Revised (SACIE-R) scales to measure the teacher self-efficacy (Emmers et al., 2020). Also, another study by Sharma et al. compares teacher self-efficacy from Hong Kong, Australia, India, and Canada, using Inclusive Practices Scale (IPS) (Sharma et al., 2021). Likewise, Pujaningsih and Ambarwati examine the self-efficacy of 34 prospective elementary-level teachers using The Teachers' sense of teacher efficacy scale (TSES) (Pujaningsih & Ambarwati, 2020). There has been no research on

teacher self-efficacy that has been collected all over Indonesia. Therefore, a study is needed to evaluate teachers' self-efficacy towards inclusive education, which can be used to evaluate teacher performance and competencies in inclusive schools in Indonesia. Hence, this study examines the self-efficacy of primary and secondary education teachers in regular schools. This study observes the differences in teacher self-efficacy based on the teacher's work unit, experience in teaching students with special needs, and duration of inclusive education training they have participated in. The hypothesis of this study is that there is a significant effect of teacher self-efficacy on the implementation of inclusive education.

2. METHODS

This study uses a quantitative approach using a questionnaire. The quantitative approach is a method that is applied to research a population or sample (Sugiyono, 2016). The questionnaire is a method of gathering data or information by filling out forms with questions that can be directed to a specific person or group of persons in the organization in order to elicit responses or answers that will be analyzed by those with a specific purpose (Wijaya & Mediriansyah, 2016). The instruments containing 17 items used were the adaptation of Teachers' Efficacy for Inclusive Practice Scale (TEIP) by Sharma et al. (2012).

The participant of this study are teachers from regular junior, high, and vocational schools in Indonesia. The total of the participants is 233 teachers with the detailed information of research respondents, including their age, educational background, work unit, experience of teaching students with special needs, and training duration.

The researcher distributed questionnaires via Google form to the community of teachers in regular junior, high, and vocational schools. The participants were randomly selected from various cities and districts in Indonesia. A total of 275 participants had given responses, but only 233 participants presented complete responses. This study used teacher self-efficacy instruments with 17 items adapted from teachers' efficacy for inclusive practice scale (TEIP) developed by Sharma et al (Sharma et al., 2012), using four points Likert scale (strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree). It measured three aspects, namely teacher efficacy in implementing inclusive classroom learning (instruction), cooperating in inclusive learning (collaboration), and managing student behavior in class (managing behaviour). A Cronbach alpha value of 0.9451 with a significance of 0.05% was obtained for the instrument's validity and reliability.

Ordinal data from the teacher's self-efficacy instrument was converted into interval data using successive intervals (Hays, 1976). The data were analyzed using Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) with the help of the SPSS application. The MANOVA analysis was completed using three dependent variables (the efficacy of instruction, collaboration, and managing behavior) and three independent variables (teacher work unit, teaching experience, and training hours).

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Findings

The detailed information of research respondents, including their age, educational background, work unit, the experience of teaching students with special needs, and training duration, is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of Research Respondents' Background

Variable	f	%
Gender		
Male	88	37.8
Female	145	62.2
Age (years old)		
25 to 30	50	21.5
31 to 40	50	21.5
41 to 50	67	28.7
50 to 60	66	28.3
Level of Degree		
Bachelor	37	15.9
Master	196	84.1
Workplace unit		
Elementary School	69	29.6
Junior High School	61	26.2
Senior High School	49	21
Vocational School	54	23.2
Experience in teaching students with SEN		
Less than one years	31	13.3
1 - 3 years	51	21.9
4 - 6 years	43	18.5
7 - 10 years	34	14.6
More than ten years	74	31.7
Experience in inclusive education training		
Less than 10 hours	71	30.5
10 -.20 hours	36	15.5
21 - 30 hours	39	16.7
31- 40 hours	39	16.7
More than 41 hours	48	20.6

Table 1 shows that most respondents are female and have a master's degree. In addition, the respondents' age ranged from 25 to 60 years old (approaching retirement age), with an even distribution.

Table 2. Results of Multivariate Test

Effect		Value	F	Sig.
Intercept	Roy's Largest Root	41.319	2148.591[b]	.000
Workplace unit		.100	5.284	.002
Experience		.031	1.2093	.309
Training		.074	2.924	.023

Multivariate test is a hypothesis testing technique in which numerous variables are changed. Table 2 shows the multivariate test results using Roy's Largest Root showed a p-value of 0.002 at .05 significance, indicating the statistically significant results. Besides, the result suggests that a substantial proportion of teachers' workplace units affects their instruction efficacy, collaboration efficacy, and managing behaviour efficacy.

In addition, table 2 shows the training variable shows a p-value of 0.023 at 0.05 significance. It signifies that differences in training duration also affect teachers' efficacy of instruction, collaboration, and managing behavior efficacy. In contrast, the teaching experience of teaching students with special needs variable attains a p-value of 0.309 at 0.05 significance, representing non statistically significant effects of teachers' experience on their instruction, collaboration, and managing behavior efficacy.

Furthermore, table 2 shows the Tests of Between-Subjects Effects were also carried out. This test examined the significant effect of independent variables (workplace units, training, and teaching experience) on the three aspects of efficacy (instruction, collaboration, and managing behavior). The test results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Results of Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Aspect	Dependent variable	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	Instruction	4.64	1.433	.031
	Collaboration	7.66	1.101	.306
	Managing Behavior	11.94	1.397	.042
Intercept	Instruction	13732.79	4240.937	.000
	Collaboration	23762.03	3414.001	.000
	Managing Behavior	37085.16	4337.950	.000
Workplace unit	Instruction	9.54	2.948	.035
	Collaboration	18.95	2.723	.046
	Managing Behavior	37.83	4.426	.005
Experience	Instruction	1.17	.364	.834
	Collaboration	.54	.079	.989
	Managing Behavior	5.19	.608	.658
Training	Instruction	3.78	1.168	.327
	Collaboration	15.18	2.182	.073
	Managing Behavior	16.33	1.911	.111

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects are the ability to account for variance in the dependent variable is examined. Table 3 shows the teachers' workplace unit variable obtained a p-value of 0.035 at 0.05 significance, showing that the workplace unit variable affects the instruction efficacy. In comparison, the collaboration in the workplace unit variable had a p-value of .046 at 0.05 significance which indicates the workplace unit variable's effects on collaboration efficacy. The efficacy of managing behavior shows a p-value of 0.005 at 0.05 significance, highlighting the workplace unit effects on managing behavior efficacy. Thus, teachers' workplace unit differences affect the three aspects of efficacy: instruction, collaboration, and managing behavior.

Table 3 shows in the instruction efficacy, the teachers' experience variable showed a p-value of 0.834, showing no effect of teachers' experience on instruction efficacy. Similarly, the teachers' experience variable obtained a p-value of 0.989 in the collaboration efficacy, indicating no impacts of teachers' experience on collaboration efficacy. In the managing behavior, the teachers' experience variable attained a p-value of .658, showing that teachers' experience carries no effects on the managing behavior efficacy. Thus, the teachers' experience in teaching students with special needs has no impact on their instruction, collaboration, and management behavior efficacy.

Table 3 shows the teacher training attained a p-value of 0.327, 0.73, and 0.111 toward the instruction, collaboration, and managing behavior efficacy. Thus, the teacher training variable in inclusive education does not affect the efficacy of instruction, collaboration, and managing behavior. This conclusion is different from the results of the multivariate test.

Table 3 shows in the corrected model, the instruction variable (p = .031) and the managing behavior variable (p = 0.042) is significant at 0.05 level. It can further predict the relationship between the workplace unit variable the instructional and managing behavior efficacy. Therefore, it is considered feasible to be included in the regression model.

Based on the results of the Multivariate Test and strengthened in the Tests of Between-Subjects Effects, it was decided that only the workplace unit variable affected the instructional, collaboration, and managing behavior efficacy. Additionally, Levene's test was also conducted to identify the homogeneity of the dependent variable based on the teacher's workplace unit.

Table 4. Results of Levene's Test based on Workplace Units

Variable	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Instruction	.750	3	229	.524
Collaboration	2.024	3	229	.111
Managing Behavior	3.380	3	229	.019

Levene's test is used to determine whether or not k samples have equal variances. The presence of equal variances across samples is referred to as variance homogeneity. Table 4 shows that the instruction efficacy has a p-value of 0.524, while the collaboration has a p-value of 0.111. The scores indicate that the teacher's workplace units data on instruction efficacy and collaboration efficacy data groups have homogeneous variants. Meanwhile, in the managing behavior, the teachers' workplace unit attained p = 0.019, significant at 0.05 level, indicating that the managing behavior efficacy group is not homogeneous.

Further, the Post Hoc Test was carried out in two procedures, namely Bonferroni and Games-Howel. Bonferroni procedure was used to test the instruction and collaboration efficacy as it fulfilled the homogeneity requirements. On the other hand, Games-Howel was used to test the managing behaviour efficacy because of the non-homogenous data group.

Table 5. Results of Post Hoc Test for Instruction Efficacy

	Workplace unit (I)	Workplace unit (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Bonferroni	ES	JHS	1.33483*	.000
		SHS	.53085	.772
		VS	.38535	1.000
	JHS	ES	-1.33483*	.000
		SHS	-.80398	.153
		VS	-.94948*	.041
	SHS	ES	-.53085	.772
		JHS	.80398	.153
		VS	-.14550	1.000
	VS	ES	-.38535	1.000
		JHS	.94948*	.041
		SHS	.14550	1.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.
ES = Elementary School
JHS = Junior High School
SHS = Senior High School
VS = Vocational School

A post-hoc test is performed to determine which groups differ from one another in this case is Instruction Efficacy. Table 5 shows that the instruction efficacy variable for the elementary school and junior high school workplace units is statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). Thus, the instructional efficacy of the teacher in elementary and junior high schools is distinctive. In the workplace units, junior high and vocational schools have a p-value of 0.041 at 0.05 significance showing instructional efficacy different on teacher task units in vocational and junior high schools.

Table 6. Post Hoc Test for Collaboration Efficacy

	Workplace unit (I)	Workplace unit (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Bonferroni	ES	JHS	1.50993*	.007
		SHS	.61254	1.000
		VS	.09557	1.000
	JHS	ES	-1.50993*	.007
		SHS	-.89739	.457
		VS	-1.41436*	.026
	SHS	ES	-.61254	1.000
		JHS	.89739	.457
		VS	-.51697	1.000
	VS	ES	-.09557	1.000
		JHS	1.41436*	.026
		SHS	.51697	1.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.
ES = Elementary School
JHS = Junior High School
SHS = Senior High School
VS = Vocational School

A post-hoc test is performed to determine which groups differ from one another, in this case, it is Collaboration Efficacy. Table 6 shows the post hoc test results for collaboration efficacy variables based on different teachers' workplace units. The collaboration efficacy variable for elementary and junior high school work units has a p-value of 0.007 at 0.05 significance, showing a distinction in collaboration efficacy based on the teacher task unit in elementary and junior high schools. Meanwhile,s collaboration efficacy variable for the vocational school and junior high school workplace units has a p-value of 0.026 at 0.05 significance. Thus, there is a difference in collaboration efficacy based on teacher task units in vocational and junior high schools.

Table 7. Post Hoc Test for Managing Behavior Efficacy

	Workplace unit (I)	Workplace unit (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Games-Howel	ES	JHS	1.46284*	.048
		SHS	1.41293	.095
		VS	.21667	.980
	JHS	ES	-1.46284*	.048
		SHS	-.04992	1.000
		VS	-1.24617	.074
	SHS	ES	-1.41293	.095
		JHS	.04992	1.000
		VS	-1.19626	.147
	VS	ES	-.21667	.980
		JHS	1.24617	.074
		SHS	1.19626	.147

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.
ES = Elementary School
JHS = Junior High School
SHS = Senior High School
VS = Vocational School

A post-hoc test is conducted in order to ascertain the specific groups that exhibit differences from one another, specifically in relation to Managing Behaviour Efficacy. According to the results of the Post Hoc Test presented in table 7, the efficacy variable pertaining to behaviour management in elementary and junior high school work environments demonstrates a p-value of 0.0487, which is below

the 0.05 significant level. The score represents varying levels of effectiveness in behaviour management across different task units among teachers in elementary and junior high schools.

3.2 Discussions

The findings indicate that significantly different teachers' instructional, collaboration, and managing behavior efficacy, was observed to be induced by their distinctive task unit. The significantly different showed by the p-value of each aspect. In instructional effectiveness the p-value was 0.041, in collaboration the p-value was 0.026, and in managing behavior efficacy the p-value was 0.0487. The three aspects of p-value were less than 0.05 significance ($p < 0.05$). The three scores signifies different efficacy of each aspect based on teachers' task units in elementary and junior high schools. Meanwhile, teachers' experience in teaching students with special needs carried no dirrect effects on teacher self-efficacy scores. In comparison, the teacher inclusive education training duration had feeble effects on their efficacy scores. In contrast, the Tests of Between-Subjects Effects results presented no significant difference in teachers' instruction, collaboration, and management learning efficacy.

The primary school teachers had the highest self-efficacy level and significantly different collaboration efficacy compared to the junior high school teachers. The vocational high school teachers also had a higher level of self-efficacy than the junior high school teachers. Meanwhile, a significantly different management behavior efficacy was observed between elementary and junior high teachers. Our findings are equated to other studies focusing on the subjects teachers (Emmers et al., 2020; Subban et al., 2021). Meanwhile, research on pre-service teachers is used as a complement (Ahsan et al., 2012; Pujaningsih & Ambarwati, 2020; Romi & Leyser, 2006). The differences in elementary and secondary school teachers' self-efficacy are generated by students' distinctive characteristics and development. Teachers perceive conducting learning, managing student behavior, and collaborating in secondary schools are more challenging than in elementary schools.

Furthermore, there was no discernible variation in self-efficacy among teachers from elementary, senior high, and vocational high schools. Remarkably, according to the data shown in Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7, it can be observed that elementary school teachers exhibit higher levels of self-efficacy scores in comparison to junior high school instructors across all three dimensions of efficacy. This disparity arises likely as a result of variations in instructional methodologies. The varying academic needs of students in vocational schools and basic schools are also interconnected. In vocational schools, children with special needs receive focused instruction in practical skills, ensuring their proficiency in certain trades. Conversely, in junior high school, it is expected that students with special needs possess a strong academic aptitude in order to progress to the high school level. Elementary school teachers typically specialise in instructing a specific class or grade level, thereby earning the designation of "class teachers." In junior high schools, teachers primarily focus on delivering instruction in specific areas, including mathematics, language, science, and physical education (PE). These teachers are sometimes referred to as subject specialists or subject teachers. Classroom teachers possess a more comprehensive grasp of students with disabilities compared to subject-specific teachers due to their extended and more frequent periods of interaction.

Our analysis results confirm that the teaching experience of students with needs had no impact on teacher self-efficacy based on table 3. Similar to Kuyini, et al., research involving 184 primary school teachers in Ghana (Kuyini et al., 2020). Romi & Leyser identified that experience affected teachers' managing student behavior efficacy and carried no significant effect on the instruction or teaching efficacy (Romi & Leyser, 2006).

Mojavezi & Tamiz also identified that, in Finish and Africa, teachers' teaching experience on students with disabilities affects teacher instruction, collaboration, and managing behavior efficacy (Mojavezi & Tamiz, 2012). In China, teaching experience on students with disabilities affects teachers' collaboration and managing behavior efficacy (Mojavezi & Tamiz, 2012). Similarly, Nuri et al revealed that teachers who had more working hours in special schools had higher self-efficacy scores than teachers with fewer working hours (Nuri et al., 2017). In addition, teachers in special schools have

higher collaboration efficacy than teachers in mainstream or regular schools, while teachers in traditional schools have greater sympathy than special school teachers in managing behavior efficacy (Malinen, 2013). Emmers examine self-efficacy at the higher education level and conclude that lecturers with high experience teaching students with disabilities present more positive attitudes towards disability and higher self-efficacy (Emmers et al., 2020).

In this study, the duration of inclusive education training attended by teachers carries no effect on teachers' self-efficacy, linear to Subban et al., that examined 158 junior high school teachers (Subban et al., 2021). Likewise, in China and South Africa, teachers' duration of special education training has no effect on their self-efficacy (Mojavezi & Tamiz, 2012). In contrast, Merrit et al concluded that teachers who received special education training had higher self-efficacy scores than teachers with less and no training experience (Merritt et al., 2017). In addition, Malinen et al. (2013) found that teacher training in inclusive education affects teacher self-efficacy in aspects of instructional efficacy, collaboration, and managing behaviour (Malinen, 2013). Similar to our finding, Romi & Leyser also found no different self-efficacy scores between groups of teachers who received a lot of or frequent training and groups of teachers who received moderate-level training (Romi & Leyser, 2006). Therefore, less than ten and more than 41 hours of training duration present the same effect on teacher self-efficacy. From our findings, we conclude that identifying training duration, training materials structure, and approaches is essential.

4. CONCLUSION

Teachers are the main key to the implementation of inclusive education, as teachers are mentors, administrators, facilitators, and evaluators. Therefore, teachers must recognize and aid the fulfillment of diverse learning needs, including for students with special needs. There has been no research on teacher self-efficacy that has been collected all over Indonesia. Therefore, a study is needed to evaluate teachers' self-efficacy towards inclusive education which can be used to evaluate teacher performance and competencies in inclusive schools in Indonesia. Hence, this study examines the self-efficacy of primary and secondary education teachers in regular schools. This study observes the differences in teacher self-efficacy based on the teacher's work unit, experience in teaching students with special needs, and duration of inclusive education training they have participated in. The instruments that were used were the adaptation of Teachers' Efficacy for Inclusive Practice Scale (TEIP). This study concludes that only the teacher's workplace unit affects three aspects of teacher self-efficacy: instruction, collaboration, and managing behavior efficacy. In addition, the teachers teaching experience on students with disabilities and their special education training duration have no significant effect on their self-efficacy.

Similar to the other studies, this study also has limitations. Our random selection of participants' through the Google form results in an unbalanced proportion of participants' educational backgrounds (between undergraduate and graduate). Future studies are recommended to only focus on the teacher training duration. In addition, the structure of training materials, training approaches, and strategies, training providers are also essential to be investigated. As a result, they are expected to produce a more accurate description of teacher-inclusive education training, both in the pre-service and in-service contexts.

REFERENCES

Ahsan, M. T., Sharma, U., & Deppeler, J. M. (2012). Exploring Pre-Service Teachers' Perceived Teaching-Efficacy, Attitudes and Concerns about Inclusive Education in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, *8*(2), 1–20.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, *37*(2), 122–147. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.37.2.122

Dakir, D. (2014). *Manajemen layanan pendidikan siswa berkebutuhan khsusus prespektif religious, filosofis, yuridis dan historis [Management of education services for students with special needs from religious, philosophical, juridical and historical perspectives]*. K-Media.

Emmers, E., Baeyens, D., & Petry, K. (2020). Attitudes and self-efficacy of teachers towards inclusion in higher education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *35*(2), 139–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2019.1628337

Forbes, F. (2007). Towards inclusion: an Australian perspective. *Support for Learning*, *22*(2), 66–71. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9604.2007.00449.x

Freeman, S. F. N., & Alkin, M. C. (2000). Academic and Social Attainments of Children with Mental Retardation in General Education and Special Education Settings. *Remedial and Special Education*, *21*(1), 3–26. https://doi.org/10.1177/074193250002100102

Hays, W. L. (1976). *Quantification in Psychology*. Prentice Hall.

Horne, P. E., & Timmons, V. (2009). Making it work: teachers' perspectives on inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *13*(3), 273–286. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110701433964

Junaidi, A. R., & Junaidi, A. R. (2019). Inclusive Education in East Java: The Case of Inclusive Education Policy and Practice in East Java, Indonesia. *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Education and Technology (ICET 2019)*. https://doi.org/10.2991/icet-19.2019.137

Kustawan, D. (2013). *Manajemen pendidikan inklusif (Kiat sukses mengelola pendidikan inklusif di sekolah umum & kejuruan [Inclusive education management (Tips for successfully managing inclusive education in general & vocational schools)]*. PT. Luxima metro media.

Kuyini, A. B., Desai, I. (Ishwar), & Sharma, U. (2020). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, attitudes and concerns about implementing inclusive education in Ghana. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *24*(14), 1509–1526. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1544298

Lindsay, G. (2007). Educational psychology and the effectiveness of inclusive education/mainstreaming. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *77*(1), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1348/000709906X156881

Lipscomb, S. T., Chandler, K. D., Abshire, C., Jaramillo, J., & Kothari, B. (2022). Early Childhood Teachers' Self-efficacy and Professional Support Predict Work Engagement. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *50*(4), 675–685. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-021-01182-5

Loreman, T., Sharma, U., & Forlin, C. (2013). Do Pre-service Teachers Feel Ready to Teach in Inclusive Classrooms? A Four Country Study of Teaching Self-efficacy. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *38*(1). https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2013v38n1.10

Malinen, O. P. (2013). *Inclusive education from teachers' perspective: Examining pre-and in-service teachers' self-efficacy and attitudes in Mainland China* [Doctoral dissertation, Itä-Suomen yliopisto]. https://erepo.uef.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/12541/urn_isbn_978-952-61-1167-4.pdf

Merritt, E. G., Palacios, N., Banse, H., Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., & Leis, M. (2017). Teaching practices in Grade 5 mathematics classrooms with high-achieving English learner students. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *110*(1), 17–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2015.1034352

Mojavezi, A., & Tamiz, M. P. (2012). The Impact of Teacher Self-efficacy on the Students' Motivation and Achievement. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *2*(3). https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.3.483-491

Musfira, R. S., Karlina, N., & Susanti, E. (2022). Pengaruh Pelatihan Kompetensi Tenaga Pendidik Pendidikan Inklusif terhadap Kinerja Guru dalam Menyelenggarakan Pendidikan Inklusif di SMPN 30 Bandung [The Effect of Inclusive Education Educators Competency Training on Teacher Performance in Organising Inclusive Education at SMPN 30 Bandung]. *JANE - Jurnal Administrasi Negara*, *13*(2), 185. https://doi.org/10.24198/jane.v13i2.28703

Nuri, C., Demirok, M. S., & Direktör, C. (2017). Determination of Self-efficacy and Burnout State of Teachers Working in the Special Education Field in Terms of Different Variables. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, *5*(3), 160. https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v5i3.2237

Peraturan Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional. (2009). *Pendidikan Inklusif [Inclusive Education]* (No. 70).

Pujaningsih, P., & Ambarwati, U. (2020). SELF EFFICACY CHANGES IN COLLABORATIVE COURSE FOR INCLUSIVE EDUCATION PRESERVICE TEACHERS. *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, *39*(1), 79–88. https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v39i1.26669

Romi, S., & Leyser, Y. (2006). Exploring inclusion preservice training needs: a study of variables associated with attitudes and self-efficacy beliefs. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *21*(1), 85–105. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856250500491880

Sailer, M., Stadler, M., Schultz-Pernice, F., Franke, U., Schöffmann, C., Paniotova, V., Husagic, L., & Fischer, F. (2021). Technology-related teaching skills and attitudes: Validation of a scenario-based self-assessment instrument for teachers. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *115*, 106625. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106625

Schwarzer, R., & Hallum, S. (2008). Perceived Teacher Self-Efficacy as a Predictor of Job Stress and Burnout: Mediation Analyses. *Applied Psychology*, *57*(s1), 152–171. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00359.x

Sharma, N., Pratap Yadav, V., & Sharma, A. (2021). Attitudes and empathy of youth towards physically disabled persons. *Heliyon*, *7*(8), e07852. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07852

Sharma, U., Loreman, T., & Forlin, C. (2012). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, *12*(1), 12–21. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2011.01200.x

Subban, P., Round, P., & Sharma, U. (2021). 'I can because I think I can'': an investigation into Victorian secondary school teacher's self-efficacy beliefs regarding the inclusion of students with disabilities.' *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *25*(3), 348–361. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1550816

Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D [Quantitative, Qualitative and R&D Research Methods]*. Alfabeta.

Sunardi. (2009). *Pendidikan anak berkebutuhan khusus secara inklusif [Inclusive education for children with special needs]*. FKIP UNS.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *17*(7), 783–805. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1

Tugiah, T., & Trisoni, R. (2022). Kurangnya Perhatian Orang Tua Terhadap Pendidikan Anak-Anak Inklusif Di Kamang Baru [Parents' Lack of Attention to Inclusive Children's Education in Kamang Baru]. *Jurnal Sosial Teknologi*, *2*(12), 1387–1397. https://sostech.greenvest.co.id/index.php/sostech/article/view/518/976

Viel-Ruma, K., Houchins, D., Jolivette, K., & Benson, G. (2010). Efficacy Beliefs of Special Educators: The Relationships Among Collective Efficacy, Teacher Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, *33*(3), 225–233. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406409360129

Warsi, L. Q., & Khurshid, K. (2022). The Role of Self-Assessment in English Language Teachers' Professional Development in Pakistan. *Education Research International*, *2022*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/9401995

Wijaya, H. O. L., & Mediriansyah, M. (2016). Perancangan Sistem Informasi Data Survei Sosial Ekonomi Daerah (Suseda) Berbasis Web Mobile [Design of Mobile Web-Based Regional Socio-Economic Survey (Suseda) Data Information System]. *Jurnal Komputer Terapan*, *2*(2), 137–148.

You, S., Kim, E., & Shin, K. (2019). Teachers' Belief and Efficacy Toward Inclusive Education in Early Childhood Settings in Korea. *Sustainability*, *11*(5), 1489. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11051489

Zuniar, F., & Chamdani, M. (2017). Pengelolaan Kelas yang Baik dalam Meningkatkan Kualitas Pembelajaran di Kelas Inklusi [Good classroom management in improving the quality of learning in inclusive classrooms]. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Inovasi Pendidikan*.